



# Analyzing Gene Expression Data using Categories (work in progress)

---

Robert Gentleman

# Outline

---

- Description of the experimental setting
- A brief description of differential gene selection
- Categories and how to use them
- Related ideas
- Example: ALL data set from the Ritz Lab
- Concluding Remarks

# Experiments/Data

---

- There are  $n$  samples
- for each sample we measure mRNA expression levels on  $G$  genes
- we consider the case where there are two phenotypes (e.g. BCR/ABL vs NEG)
- A t-test can be computed, for each gene comparing the two samples (other test statistics can be handled easily)

# Differential Expression

---

- Usual approach is to try and find the set of differentially expressed genes [those with extreme values of the univariate statistic,  $\mathbf{x}$ ]
- Often adjusting in some way for multiple comparisons
- This can be criticized on many grounds
  - it introduces an artificial distinction - differentially expressed
  - it focuses attention on only a few genes that change a lot

# Differential Expression

---

- $p$ -value correction methods don't really do what we want
- to see if too many genes of a particular type have been selected a Hypergeometric calculation is made, but it relies on the artificial distinction between expressed and not expressed
- we (and others) propose a different approach: find sets of genes whose expression changes in concert, possibly not by a large amount

# Holistic Approach

---

- we will attempt to find categories of genes where there are potentially small but coordinated changes in gene expression
- an obvious situation is one where genes in a category all show small but consistent change in a particular direction

# Related Work

---

- PGC-1 alpha-responsive genes involved in oxidative phosphorylation are coordinately downregulated in human diabetes. Mootha et al, Nature Genetics, 2003
- mTOR inhibition reverses Akt-dependent prostate intraepithelial neoplasia through regulation of apoptotic and HIF-1 dependent pathways, Majumder et al, Nature Medicine, 2004
- Discovering statistically significant pathways in expression profiling studies. Tian et al, PNAS, 2005,

# Gene Set Enrichment

---

- proposed by Mootha et al (2003)
- very similar (and was one of the motivations) but more complex and computationally expensive
- they discuss gene sets,  $S$ , which are the same as categories



# Gene Set Enrichment

---

- For each gene set  $S$ , a Kolmogorov-Smirnov running sum is computed
- The assayed genes are ordered according to some criterion (say a two sample  $t$ -test; or signal-to-noise ratio SNR).
- Beginning with the top ranking gene the running sum increases when a gene in set  $S$  is encountered and decreases otherwise
- The enrichment score (ES) for a set  $S$  is defined to be the largest value of the running sum.

# Gene Set Enrichment


---

- The maximal ES (MES), over all sets  $S$  under consideration is recorded.
- For each of  $B$  permutations of the class label, ES and MES values are computed.
- The observed MES is then compared to the  $B$  values of MES that have been computed, via permutation.
- This is a single  $p$ -value for all tests and hence needs no correction (on the other hand you are testing only one thing).

# From Mootha *et al*

ES=enrichment score  
for each gene  
= scaled K-S dist


A set called OXPHOS  
got the largest ES score,  
with  $p=0.029$  on 1,000  
permutations.



# OXPPOS


(A small difference for many genes)

All genes  
OXPPOS




# Mootha's ts are approx normal


Histogram of t




Normal Q-Q Plot for t



# Normal qq-plot of $\sqrt{n} \times \bar{t}$



OXPHOS



# Selection of Categories

---

- ❑ pathways (KEGG, cMAP, BioCarta)
- ❑ molecular function, biological process cellular location (GO)
- ❑ predefined sets from the published literature etc
- ❑ regions of synteny; cytochrome bands
- ❑ some care should be exercised to select categories that are of interest *a priori*
  - ❑ there are more categories than genes so you will simply end up back in the multiple comparison problem

# Categories

---

- a set of **categories** is merely a grouping of genes (entities)
- the groups do not need to be exhaustive or disjoint
- we do not need to be completely right, we can have some genes that are not in the category, and we can miss some, but not too many
- we are relying on averaging to help adjust for mistakes
- given the state of genomic knowledge this seems preferable



# Categories

---

- the elements of  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}[i,j]=1$  if gene  $j$  is in category  $i$
- the row sums represent the number of genes in each category
- the column sums represent the number of categories a gene is in
- if two rows are identical (for a given set of genes) then the two categories are aliased (in the usual statistical sense)
- other patterns can cause problems and need some study

# Categories

---

- the simplest transformation is to simply sum up the  $t$ -statistics for all genes in each category
- we divide the sum by the square root of the number of genes per category (this is right if genes are independent - an unrealistic assumption)
- we could take the median, or use a sign-test within categories
- then the resultant statistics, under the null hypothesis, have approximately a  $N(0,1)$  distribution
- we can plot them and look for big/small values

# Categories: Reference Distribution

---

- an alternative is to generate many  $t$ -tests from a reference distribution
- one distribution of interest is to go back to the original expression data and either permute the sample labels or bootstrap to provide a reference distribution
- you should not (as Tian et al do) permute the gene labels [what is your null hypothesis?]

# Comparisons

---

- you can do either within category comparisons
  - for a given category is the observed test statistic unusual
- or overall comparisons
  - are any of the observed category statistics unusually large with respect to the entire reference distribution
- the former requires some consideration of multiple testing issues
- note that the approach is inherently multivariate, one data set gives  $G$  test statistics (one per gene) and these are transformed to yield one per category

# Bayesian Approach

---

- following Newton et al, we could compute the posterior probability that a gene is differentially expressed
- then  $\mathbf{x}$ , our G vector is a set of probabilities
- $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{Ax}$ , is then a C vector of the expected number of differentially expressed genes in each category

# Bayesian Approach

---

- adjustment for category size is needed
- an expected number per category can be obtained by using  $p^*$ =mean of the posterior probabilities and the category size
- categories that deviate substantially from that expected number are of interest

# Example: ALL Data

---

- samples on patients with ALL were assayed using HGu95Av2 GeneChips
- we were interested in comparing those with BCR/ABL (basically a 9;22 translocation) with those that had no cytogenetic abnormalities (NEG)
- 37 BCR/ABL and 42 NEG
- non-specific filter left us with 2526 probe sets


# Example: ALL Data

---

- we then mapped the probes to KEGG pathways
- the mapping to pathways is via LocusLink ID
  - we have a many-to-one problem and solve it by taking the probe set with the most extreme *t*-statistic
- this left 556 genes
- much of the reduction is due to the lack of pathway information (but there is also substantial redundancy on the chip)
- then I decided to ignore categories with fewer than 5 members



Normal Q-Q Plot




# Which Categories

---

- so the qq-plot looks interesting and identifies at least one category that looks interesting
- we identify it, and create a plot that shows the two group means (BCR/ABL and NEG)
- if all points are below or above the 45 degree line that should be interesting

**Ribosome**  
Overall: -6.692



# Ribosome

---


- the mean expression of genes in this **pathway** seem to be higher in the NEG group
- might be better to say suppressed in BCR/ABL (since they are relatively more homogeneous)

# Permutation Test

---

- $B=5000$ ,  $p=0.05$
- $NEG > BCR/ABL$ 
  - Ribosome
- $BCR/ABL > NEG$ 
  - Cytokine-cytokine receptor interaction
  - MAPK signaling pathway
  - Complement and coagulation cascades
  - TGF-beta signaling pathway
  - Apoptosis
  - Neuroactive ligand-receptor interaction
  - Huntington's disease
  - Prostaglandin and leukotriene metabolism

BCR/ABL vs NEG - Categories are cytochrome band (only those with more than 10 genes per band)




Two largest are 9q34 and 1p36 - both already implicated

# Aliasing

---



- all others have ignored this - but it does matter
- when we use categories, two categories can have substantial overlap
- if they are both significant, we might ask why

# For cytokine-cytokine and Jak-Stat we have





# Comparison of Gene Expression



# Some other extensions

---

- categories might be a better way to do meta-analysis
- one of the fundamental problems with meta-analysis on gene expression data is the gene matching problem
- even technical replicates on the same array do not show similar expression patterns

# Extensions

---

- if instead we compute per category effects these are sort of independent of the probes that were used
- matching is easier and potentially more biologically relevant
- the problem of adjustment still exists; how do we make two categories with different numbers of expression estimates comparable

# Extensions

---

- you can do per array computations
- residuals are one of the most underused tools for analyzing microarrays
- we first filter genes for variability
- next standardize on a per gene basis - subtract the median divide by MAD
- now  $X^* = AX$ , is a  $C \times n$  array, one entry for each category for each sample



# Discovering Categories

---

- everything I have said up to now requires that categories be predefined
- how do we find new categories?
- use some form of feature selection (BMA, machine learning) and take the resulting features (genes)
- use those as *seeds* to find other genes whose expression is close to the seed gene
- those sufficiently close would form a category

# Concluding Remarks

---

- the analysis of gene expression data still requires more research
- we should be looking at mechanisms for coordinated expression
  - transcription factors
  - amplifications
  - deletions
  - change in chromatin structure

# Concluding Remarks

---

- $p$ -value corrections are not really the right approach here
- bringing more biology to bear seems to be more likely to bear fruit
- we need some results to indicate how to deal with the coordinated gene expression (lack of independence within a category)



# Acknowledgements

---

- Terry Speed (also some slides are his)
- Arden Miller
- Vincent Carey
- Michael Newton
- Kasper Hansen
- Jerry Ritz
- Sabina Chiaretti
- Sandrine Dudoit
- Zhen Jiang
- Adrian Raftery